



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—ARM-PITTING AMONG THE GREEKS.

An ancient Greek, if he murdered a man, used sometimes to mutilate the body of his victim in a peculiar way. This fact and the verb denoting the mutilation are known to us from two classic passages, both relating to the same case—the indignities offered by Clytemnestra to the corpse of Agamemnon. These passages are Aesch. Cho. 439 sqq.:

ἐμασχαλίσθη δέ γ', ὥς τόδ' εἰδῆς,<sup>1</sup>

and Soph. El. 444 sqq.:

ἰφ' ἦς (sc. Κλυταιμνήστρας) θανὼν ἄτιμος, ὥστε δυσμενῆς,  
ἐμασχαλίσθη καπὶ λουτροῖσιν κάρα  
κηλίδας ἐξέμαξεν.<sup>2</sup>

In the first, the subject is Agamemnon; in the second, the subject of ἐξέμαξεν is, perhaps rather harshly, supplied from ἰφ' ἦς.

The present paper concerns itself with two points—first, In what did the *μασχαλίζειν* consist? and second, What did the murderer hope to gain by it,—what, in other words, was the rationale of the *μασχαλίζειν*?

Of the simple meaning of the verb there cannot be much doubt. The Lexicons of Photius, Suidas, and Hesychius (all under the word *μασχαλίσματα*), the Etym. Magn. (s. v. *ἀπάργματα*), and Isaac Vossius's MS (p. 333, 53 of Gaisford's Et. M.) agree in testifying that it was customary for those who had treacherously slain a man to cut off the extremities of his limbs, string the pieces together, and fasten them under the armpits of the corpse by a band or girdle round the neck. To do this was *μασχαλίζειν*; the fragments so treated were *μασχαλίσματα*.<sup>3</sup> This explanation rests ultimately

<sup>1</sup> For ὥς τόδ' εἰδῆς the Med. has *τῶστοστείδης*. The reading does not affect the argument.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. R. iv 477-480, usually adduced as a *locus classicus*, will be more conveniently and more appropriately treated as a scholium.

<sup>3</sup> The *μασχαλίσματα* were also called, in a general way, *ἀκρωτηριάσματα*, "bits cut off of the extremities" (Et. M. p. 118, 22; Hesych. s. v. *τομία*, n. 1111, IV 164 Schmidt; Schol. Ap. R. iv 477), *ἀκρωτήρια* (Et. M. *ιδ.*), *ἀπάργματα* (*ιδ.*), *ἐξάργματα* (Ap. R. iv 477, cf. Schol.), *τομία* and *ἀποτμήματα* (Hesych. s. v. *τομία*).

on the authority of Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose gloss, as preserved by Photius and Suidas, is thus restored by Nauck (Ar. Byz. Frag. lxxviii, p. 221). I give the variants not only from these two lexicographers, but from Hesych. s. v. *μασχαλίσματι* (n. 381, III 75 Schmidt), a gloss evidently from the same source.<sup>1</sup>

*Μασχαλίσματα*: Ἀριστοφάνης<sup>2</sup> παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἡλέκτρᾳ κείσθαι τὴν λέξιν ἔθος σημαίνουσιν. οἱ γὰρ φονεύσαντες<sup>3</sup> ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τινὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ (τὴν)<sup>4</sup> μῆνιν ἐκκλίνειν ἀκρωτηριάσαντες<sup>5</sup> μόρια<sup>6</sup> τούτου<sup>7</sup> καὶ ὀρμαθίσαντες<sup>8</sup> ἐξεκρέμασαν<sup>10</sup> τοῦ<sup>11</sup> τραχήλου διὰ τῶν μασχαλῶν διείραντες, καὶ μασχαλίσματα προσηγόρευσαν.<sup>12</sup>

With this agrees very well, so far as the meaning of the verb is concerned, Et. Magn. and Vossius's MS (ll. cc.) and the last part of Schol. Laur. on Soph. El. 445.<sup>13</sup> To these may be added the short gloss in Hesych.: *μασχαλισθῆναι. ἀνηρτῆσθαι ἐκ τῶν μασχαλῶν* (n. 383, III 75 Schmidt). The Schol. Ap. R. is not at variance with the rest; he merely says that the *ἀκρωτηριάσματα* were hung

It should be noticed that the only special word of all these is *μασχαλίσματα*, which signifies "the pieces [cut off and put] under the armpits"; whereas the others, used sometimes simply for purposes of definition, denote merely "cut off extremities" or the like, and have no particular reference to the peculiar features of the mutilation. *Μασχαλίσματα* was also used to denote pieces from the shoulder placed upon the thighs in sacrifice, a meaning which may account for some of the confusion we shall meet with later on.

<sup>1</sup> Phot. = Phot. Lex. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα*, p. 249, 19 Porson; Suid. = Suid. Lex. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα*, II, pt. 1, p. 726, 19 Bernh.; Hesych. = Hesych. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα*, III 75 Schmidt; N. = Nauck.

<sup>2</sup> Excidit opinor φροσί. N. Suid. per errorem affirmat ipsum voc. *μασχάλισμα* Aristophanem gramm. legi ap. Soph. in El. perhibuisse, qui haud dubie verbum *μασχαλίζω* dixerat. Dind. in Steph. Thes. Gr. s. v. *μασχάλισμα*, V 611 C.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych.'s gloss begins here abruptly with *φονεύσαντες* [(οἱ) φον. Sch.], all that precedes, except the lemma, being omitted.

<sup>4</sup> τοῦ τὴν μῆνιν, Suid. Hesych.

<sup>5</sup> ἐκκλίνειν ἀκρωτηριάσαν, Hesych.

<sup>6</sup> τὰ μόρια, Hesych.

<sup>7</sup> τούτων, Suid. Hesych.

<sup>8</sup> After τούτων Hesych. adds οἷον ὤτων, ῥινῶν.

<sup>9</sup> ὀρμάσαντες, Phot. Hesych. omits, putting *ἐρείσαντες* in its place and leaving out *διείραντες*, which latter word Junius proposed to restore instead of *ἐρείσαντες*. Schmidt accepts the conjecture.

<sup>10</sup> ἐξεκρέμασαν Phot., ἐκρέμνων Hesych.

<sup>11</sup> ἐκ τοῦ, Hesych.

<sup>12</sup> καὶ . . . προσηγόρευσαν Hesych. om.

<sup>13</sup> Et. M.: τὰ δὲ ἀκρωτήρια εἰροντες καὶ συρράπτοντες διὰ τῶν τοῦ νεκροῦ μασχαλῶν καὶ τοῦ τραχήλου, περιετίθουν τῷ νεκρῷ. Cod. Voss.: τῶν μορίων ὀρμαθῶν ποιήσαντες κρεμᾶν κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου καὶ τῶν μασχαλῶν. Schol. Soph.: περὶ τὴν μασχάλην αὐτοῦ ἐκρέμαζον, and περιάπτειν ἑαυτοῖς τὰ ἄκρα συνείραντες διὰ τούτων. But this last is from the first part of the Scholium and the context differs from Aristophanes. See the next note but one.

from the neck, neglecting to mention the armpits at all. From these passages it is evident that Paley has all the scholiasts against him when he says (ad Aesch. *l. c.*) that the extremities were cut off and "tied with a band (*μασχαλιστήρ*) round the waist." There can be no doubt that the band was passed round the neck and the mutilated pieces "slung" by means of it under the armpits of the corpse. The atrocity was committed on the bodies of men slain by treachery, or, in general, on the bodies of murdered kinsmen. Hermann (ad Soph. *El. l. c.*) is apparently mistaken in saying that those *μασχαλίζουσι* "qui aliquem per insidias vel in bello civili necassent." The "per insidias" is abundantly justified by the *ἐπιβουλῆς* of Ar. Byz. and the use of *δολοφονέω* in the Et. M.; but the "in bello civili" rests only on the Schol. Laur. Soph., *οἱ δρῶντες ἐμφύλιον φόνον*. To deny that *ἐμφύλιος φόνος* may mean "death inflicted in civil war, in *ἐμφύλιος πόλεμος*," would be folly; but it seems more likely, inasmuch as the scholiast is annotating a passage that has to do with the murder of a husband by his wife, that *ἐμφύλιος* is used in the more restricted sense of "kindred," and that *ἐμ. φόνος* denotes "the murder of a relative," like *ἐμφύλιον αἶμα* (Pind. P. ii 57), *τοῦμφυλον αἶμα* (Soph. O. C. 407), etc. This is a minor point, however, and need not be pressed.

Just how far the mutilation went is not perfectly clear. It is commonly asserted that only the extremities of the hands and feet were cut off.<sup>1</sup> But this is not expressly stated by Aristophanes. Indeed, in the form in which Hesych. gives the gloss, we have seen (supra, p. 152) that, after *ἀκρωτηριάσαντες τὰ μόρια τούτων*, is added *οἶον ὧτων, ῥινῶν*; and the first part of Schol. Soph.<sup>2</sup> says: *ἐκ παντὸς μέρους τοῦ σώματος ἀποταμνόμενοι*. Since we are sure, however, of the hands and feet, this point too may be waived as unimportant.

The second point of our discussion, What was the purpose of the arm-pitting? brings us at once into a chaos of conflicting evidence. The ultimate object of the mutilation was, of course, to escape the consequences of the crime; but just what consequences did the criminal have in mind and how did he expect to gain immunity from them by such means? There are two main theories

<sup>1</sup> E. g., "extremas manuum partes amputasse." Herm. *l. c.*

<sup>2</sup> In referring to Schol. *El.* 445 I have used "first part" and "last part" (or *α* and *β*) arbitrarily to distinguish two different glosses found with others in that scholium, (*α*) *εἰώθεσαν* . . . *ἐλεγον*, (*β*) *ἐπὶ ταῖς καθάρσεσι* . . . *τοῦ Ἰάσονος*. These two glosses do not agree and are separated by an *ἄλλως*.

that claim to answer these questions, and they may be called for convenience the Müller theory and the Paley theory:<sup>1</sup>

I. The *μασχάλειν* was a part of the *ἀφροσύωσις*. The cut-off extremities were the *ἀπαρχή* of the victim, a sin-offering to the infernal gods to expiate the murder.<sup>2</sup>

II. The mutilation of the body was supposed to effect a corresponding mutilation of the soul, so that the shade, deprived of its limbs, would be powerless to take vengeance on the criminal.

Before appealing to the scholiasts, we should get all we can out of our two *loci classici*, which seem, to be sure, non-committal at first sight to either theory. The line in the Choephoroe is spoken by the chorus to Orestes, who is come to avenge his father's death. The long *κομμός* in which the line occurs is in great measure taken up with dwelling on the enormity of the crime of Clytemnestra, and that enormity is shown to consist not only in the bare and dreadful fact that she treacherously killed her husband by a shameful death, but in the fact that she aggravated her guilt by all manner of insults to his corpse. "Had he been slain before Troy, then would he have had an honorable tomb in a strange land; then would he reign a king among the dead, even as he was a king among mortal men" (345-361). "But you buried him like a foe, mother; you dared put him away unmourned; you banished the citizens from his funeral; you forbade all signs of grief" (429-433). It is when the anger of Orestes has been raised to fever heat by words like these that the chorus allege the crowning insult offered by Clytemnestra to her lord. "He was arm-pitted! As she treated him, so she buried him. So far did she do your father

<sup>1</sup> These names are of course pure conventions. The "Müller theory" is the theory of Ap. Rhodius and perhaps of Hermann. The "Paley theory" is well put by Stanley (ad Aesch. Cho. 437): hoc enim pacto manes caesorum impediri censebant, quo minus ipsos persequi atque infestare possint. Stanley also quotes Triclinius (ad Soph. El. 448): ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἡνίκα τινὰ διεκρήσαντο, ἀκρωτηριάζειν αὐτὸν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς μασχάλῃς ταῦτα τιθεῖναι. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποιοῦν ἵνα ἀνίσχυρον αὐτὸν ἐργάζωνται διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων τομῆς πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν ἀμυναν ἣν οἱ νεκροὶ τοὺς ζῶντας ἀμύνονται, ἐριννὺς αὐτοῖς ἐπιπέμποντες. This is a learned rifacimento of the Laurentian scholium, with some additions from Triclinius's own head.

<sup>2</sup> "Zu dem ἀφροσιῦσθαι des Mordes gehört der alte, seltsame Gebrauch des ἀκρωτηριάζειν, der μασχαλίσματα oder ἀπάργματα von der Leiche des Ermordeten." K. O. Müller, Eum. §58, n. 16 (p. 144, ed. 1833). This would be "analogous to the consecration of a person to Hades by cutting off a lock of hair." Eur. Alc. 75; Jebb on Soph. *l. c.* from Paley on Aesch. *l. c.*

dishonor, my son.”<sup>1</sup> So furious does Orestes become at these words and at Electra’s assertion that she was not allowed to attend her father’s funeral, that the chorus, eager till now to spur him on to the utmost, are constrained to calm his wrath, and beg him to temper his rage with prudence (451 sqq.). To the chorus, then, and to Orestes, the *μασχαλίζειν* is the culmination of a series of atrocities—among which are the shameful murder and the neglect of proper burial rites—which rob Agamemnon of his just rank in Hades and make his shade weak and miserable, and if weak, unable therefore to take vengeance on his murderers. Evidently the Müller theory gets no support from this passage, which, if it looks either way, rather favors the views of Paley.

The Electra mentions the *μασχαλίζειν* in that speech in which the heroine is urging Chrysothemis not to offer Clytemnestra’s libations at the tomb of Agamemnon. “Do you think,” she cries, “that the dead man will accept offerings from one who killed him dishonorably, from one by whom he was arm-pitted, and who, in expiation, wiped her bloody sword upon his head?”<sup>2</sup> In this passage careful attention should be paid to the order of words. Expiation is mentioned, to be sure, but how? The poet says *not*, “*In expiation she arm-pitted him and wiped the blood-spots from her sword upon his head*,” but “He was arm-pitted, and *in expiation she wiped her sword*,” etc. Here, if there is any meaning in arrangement in any language, “by way of expiation” (*ἐπὶ λουτροῖσιν*) cannot be taken with *ἐμασχαλίσθη*, but must go with *ἐξέμαξεν* alone. It was a deadly insult to arm-pit the corpse; it was a deadly insult to wipe the sword on the dead man’s head, as if to expiate the crime of the murderer by laying the guilt upon the victim. Electra mentions two distinct insults in a breath. She says that one of them was an expiatory ceremony; she does not say that the other was, and by not saying so she half implies the contrary. The evidence

<sup>1</sup> ἐμασχαλίσθη δὲ γ', ὥς τόδ' εἰδῆς.  
ἐπρασσε δ' ἄπ' ἐρ νιν, ὥδε θάπτει,  
μόρον κτίσαι μωμένα  
ἄφερτον αἰῶνι σῶ.  
κλίεις πατρώους δόας ἀτίμους.

<sup>2</sup> σκέψαι γὰρ εἰ σοι προσφίλως αὐτῇ δοκεῖ  
γέρα τὰδ' οὖν τάφουσι δέξασθαι νέκυσ  
ἴφ' ἥς θανὼν ἄτιμος, ὥστε δυσμενῆς,  
ἐμασχαλίσθη κάπ'ι λουτροῖσιν κάρη  
κηλίδας ἐξέμαξεν. 442-446.

afforded by this passage is important, though negative. The Paley theory is not directly strengthened, but the Müller theory is certainly shaken.

It remains to examine the scholiasts and grammarians—to cut our way through a tangled jungle of incongruous annotation. The following may serve as a provisional list of “authorities,” a list that will be shortened and simplified as we proceed :

(i) Ar. Byz. in Phot. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα* (= Suid. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα* = Hesych. s. v. *μασχαλίσματα*).

(ii) Ap. Rhod. Argonaut. iv 477–480.

(iii) Schol. Ap. Rhod. *l. c.*

(iv) Et. Magn. s. v. *ἀπάργματα*.

(v) Suid. s. v. *ἐμασχαλίσθη* (= Isaac Vossius’s MS in Gaisf.’s n. to Etym. M. p. 333, 53 = Apostol. Prov. xi 4 (p. 516 v. Leutsch) = Arsen. Violetum xxxv 14, p. 348 Walz).

(vi) Schol. Soph. El. 445 (α) } = (in different order) Suid. s. v.

(vii) Schol. Soph. El. 445 (β) } *μασχαλίσθηναι*, II 725, 17 Bernh.

Taking this catalogue as it stands, we have the following results. Ar. Byz. asserts that the *μασχαλίζειν* was *ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν* (sc. *τοῦ θανόντος*) *μῆνιν ἐκκλίνειν*;<sup>1</sup> Et. M. that it was *ἀφοσιῶσαι τὸν φόνον*; Ap. R. that, with other ceremonies, it was *θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἰλάεσθαι*; Schol. Ap. R. that, with other ceremonies, it was *πρὸς τὸ ἐξιλάσασθαι τὴν δολοφονίαν*; Suid. (v) that it was perpetrated by those *τὸ ἔργον ἀφοσιούμενοι*; Schol. Soph. α, very explicitly, that men did it *ὥσπερ τὴν δύναμιν ἐκείνων* (sc. *τῶν θανόντων*) *ἀφαιρούμενοι*, διὰ τὸ μὴ παθεῖν εἰς ὕστερον τὶ παρ’ ἐκείνων δεινόν. Schol. Soph. β is, however, rather confused;—people did this, to be sure, *ἐπὶ ταῖς καθάρσεσι*, but the motive was *ἵνα, φησὶν, ἀσθενὴς γένοιτο* (sc. *ὁ θανὼν*) *πρὸς τὸ ἀντιτίσασθαι τὸν φονέα*. To sum up, Ar. Byz. and Schol. Soph. apparently favor the Paley theory; Ap. R. and his Schol., Et. Magn., and Suid. (v) support the theory of Müller. A closer examination of these

<sup>1</sup> There is small need of argument on the meaning of the vague *τὴν μῆνιν ἐκκλίνειν*. To be sure, the words, taken by themselves, might be interpreted, “to avert the wrath of the murdered man by expiatory offerings”; but the idea that the angry ghost of Agamemnon could be propitiated by sacrificing to him his own fingers and toes is too absurd to be entertained. Besides Ar.’s words was a note on Soph. El. 445, where it is distinctly asserted that the mutilation is a cause of bitter wrath to Agamemnon. Again, *τὴν μῆνιν* might be held to mean the wrath, not of the murdered man, but of the infernal gods; but this is to do violence to the plain reference of the *τὴν*, to say nothing of the fact that insults to a corpse can hardly have been pleasant to the gods of the dead.

passages will reveal certain connections and derivations that may simplify the evidence.

We may begin with Apollonius, who, whatever his merits as a poet, is for our present purpose to be regarded as a scholar and annotator. The passage is Arg. iv 477-80. Jason has killed Medea's brother Apsyrtus:

Ἦρως δ' Αἰσονίδης ἐξάργματα τάμνε θανόντος,  
 τρίς δ' ἀπέλειξε φόνου, τρίς δ' ἐξ ἄγος ἔπτυσ' ὀδόντων,  
 ἢ θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἱλάεσθαι.  
 ὑγρὸν δ' ἐν γαίῃ κρύψεν νέκυν.

Here, it will be observed, two distinct rites are mentioned. Jason cuts from the corpse the first sacrificial pieces (*ἐξάργματα*), and he thrice takes into his mouth and thrice spits out some of the blood.<sup>1</sup> All this is said by the author to have been an ordinary ceremony for expiation of murders done by stealth. The word *μασχαλίζειν* is not used by Apollonius, nor does he say that Jason put the *ἐξάργματα* under the arm-pits of Apsyrtus, but that such was the fact is asserted by the scholiast, and the passage in the Argonautica is quoted in the Et. Magn. l. c. as well as by Schol. Soph. El. β. Müller identifies the act of Jason with the *μασχαλίζειν*, and the identity seems to be conceded on all sides. Apollonius, therefore, is the oldest authority for the opinion that the *μασχαλίζειν* was a rite of sacrifice and purification.

The scholiast on this passage has the following note (p. 502, 13 Keil): *ἐξάργματα*] τῶν ἀποθανόντων οἱ δολοφονοῦντες ἀρχαίως ἀκρωτηριασμάτα τινα ἐποιοῦν τοῦ ἀναιρουμένου καὶ ταῦτα λαβόντες ἐξήρτων τοῦ τραχήλου αὐτῶν. τῶν δὲ καλουμένων ἀκρωτηριασμάτων ἄπειρα καὶ πολλὰ ἐξάργματα. ἔπειτα τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Spitting is an obvious and almost instinctive rite of purification. Compare the phrase *πτύνειν εἰς κόλπον* and the references in Becker, Charikl. sc. 8, n. 3 (2d ed., I 240); Persius ii 32. A writer in Notes and Queries, 6th ser., VI 178, treats of spitting to avoid ill-luck, witchcraft, etc., and cites Theocritus. "According to the superstition of the West Countries, if you meet the devil, . . . you may cause him to disappear by spitting over his horns," says Coleridge in a n. to his poem "Recantation" (in Sibylline Leaves). Cf. Ralston, Russian Folk-Tales, p. 142. "Wenn man sich vor Hexen schützen will, so muss man dreimal vor ihnen ausspeien." Veckenstedt, Mythen, Sagen u. Legenden der Zamaiten (Litauer), 1883, II 103. Cf. Aesch. Fr. 376 Dind. (344 Nauck) [Plut. Mor. 358 E], quoted by Gaisford in his n. on Et. Magnum, p. 118, 22: *ἀποπτύσαι δεῖ καὶ καθήρασθαι στόμα*. The significance is plain in all these instances. "In Spain it is considered necessary to spit after pronouncing the word 'Jew.'" M. D. Conway, Wandering Jew, p. 90. Cf. Dennys, Folk-Lore of China, p. 52.



αἵματος αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τρίς εἰς τὸ στόμα ἀπέπτυνον. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποιοῦν πρὸς τὸ ἐξιλάσασθαι τὴν δολοφονίαν.

A glance at this scholium is enough to show that its author, like so many other editors and glossographers, ancient and modern, made up a good part of his note directly from his text. The last three lines, which alone bear on the present argument, are taken almost word for word from Apollonius, with a mere change from poetical to prose diction.<sup>1</sup> The scholiast then adds nothing to the Müller theory, for, so far as he supports that theory, he is simply quoting Apollonius.

The long article in the Et. M. is another stronghold of the Müller theory; but this article, on examination, will be found to break up a good deal. The Etymologus, in his desire to make his work encyclopedic, has gathered everything he could find in notes and glossaries. Parallel columns will show what he has been about.

Et. M. s. v. ἀπάργματα, p. 118, 22.

Other Glosses.

Ἀπάργματα: Λέγεται τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν  
τραγωδῶν λεγόμενα μασχαλίσματα.  
ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ τοῦ φονευθέντος  
ἀκρωτηριάσματα.

καὶ μασχαλίματα προσηγόρευσαν. Ar.  
Byz.

τομία. τὰ ἀποτμήματα, καὶ ἀκρωτηρι-  
άσματα τοῦ νεκροῦ. Hesych.  
ἀκρωτηριάσματά τινα ἐποιοῦν τοῦ  
ἀναιρουμένου. Schol. Ap. R.

ἦν γάρ τι νόμιμον, τοῖς δολοφονή-  
σασιν ἀφοσιῶσαι τὸν φόνον

ἢ θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἱλά-  
εσθαι. Ap. R. πρὸς τὸ ἐξιλά-  
σασθαι τὴν δολοφονίαν. Schol.  
Ap. R.

<sup>1</sup> By this process τρίς δ' ἀπέλειξε φόνον, τρίς δ' ἔξ ἄγος ἔπτυν' ὀδόντων becomes ἐπειτα τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τρίς εἰς τὸ στόμα ἀπέπτυνον. Similarly the scholiast substitutes the prose word δολοφονία for the poetic ἀπας, δολοκτασία; and the good Att. prose ἐξιλάσασθαι for the Epic ἱλάεσθαι. The rest of the scholium is perhaps derived from Ar. Byz. The first three lines seem to be a studious variation of the words of that scholar. οἱ φονεύσαντες ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς becomes οἱ δολοφονοῦντες; ἀκρωτηριάσαντες μόρια τούτου (var. τοῦτων) becomes (under the influence of the Apollonian ἐξάργματα τάννε θανόντος) ἀκρωτηριάσματά τινα ἐποιοῦν τοῦ ἀναιρουμένου. The Schol. Apoll. changes the ἐκκρεμάννυμι of Ar. (ἐξεκράμναναν τοῦ τραχήλου) to the equally good Att. ἐξαρτάω (ἐξήρτων τοῦ τρ.) The διὰ τῶν μασχαλῶν he omits, partly, perhaps, because it was not needed to elucidate his author, who does not use the word μασχαλίζω; partly, no doubt, because the phrase is rather vague and the meaning seemed clearer without it. As to his also omitting Ar.'s ἐκκλίνειν τὴν μῆνιν, he probably thought these words synonymous with ἐξιλάσασθαι τὴν δολοφονίαν; or, if he saw the essential difference between the two expressions, preferred to walk upon safe ground and follow his author.

διὰ τοῦ δολοφονηθέντος ἀκρωτηρια- ἀκρωτηριάσαντες μόρια τούτου καὶ  
 σμοῦ. τὰ δὲ ἀκρωτήρια εἶροντες ὀρμαθίσαντες  
 καὶ συρράπτοντες ἐξεκρέμασαν  
 διὰ τῶν τοῦ νεκροῦ μασχαλῶν τοῦ τραχήλου  
 καὶ τοῦ τραχήλου, περιετίθουν διὰ τῶν μασχαλῶν  
 τῷ νεκρῷ, καθά φησι Σοφοκλῆς διείραντες. Ar. Byz.  
 'Υφ' ἧς θανῶν ἄτιμος, κτλ.

The Etymologus then quotes Apollonius to prove ὅτι καὶ ἐγείνοντο τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἀπέπτυνον, and also cites vaguely "Aeschylus" as authority for the same custom.

The writer of this article in the Etym., then, had before him Ap. R. and Sophocles, whom he quotes, and perhaps also Aeschylus, whom he cites. That he had by him a copy of the gloss of Ar. Byz. is proved by the parallel columns just given, which show that his account of the *μασχαλίζειν* is made up, so far as description is concerned, from that scholar's words with studious use of synonyms to avoid the appearance of copying. The parallel columns, however, show something else more important: the Etym. took his theory of the *μασχαλίζειν* directly from Ap. R. This is as clear as that the Schol. Ap. did the same. We know that both these glossographs had the place in Apollonius before their eyes. The rest of the argument states itself.

ἡ θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἱλάεσθαι. Ap. R.

ἦν γάρ τι νόμιμον τοῖς δολοφονήσασιν τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιοῖον πρὸς τὸ ἐξιλάσασθαι τὴν δολοφονίαν. Et. Magn. Schol.<sup>1</sup>

Thus far the authorities for the Müller theory have been seen to reduce themselves to one, Apollonius of Rhodes. There is another gloss, however (No. v), which asserts that the *μασχαλίζειν* was a rite of expiation. I give this from Suidas with all the variants of Apostolius and Vossius's MS. Suidas s. v. *ἐμασχαλίσθη*, I, pt. 2, p. 194, 9 Bernh. [Ap. = Apostol. Prov. xi 4, p. 516 v. Leutsch in Paroemiogr., II.<sup>2</sup> V. = MS of Isaac Voss. in Gaisf.'s n. to Et. M., p. 333, 53.]

<sup>1</sup> Whether the compiler of the Etymol. was also acquainted with the Scholium on Apollonius is a question not to our purpose and need not be here discussed.

<sup>2</sup> This is the same, word for word, as Arsen. Violetum, xxxv 14 (p. 348 Walz), for Arsenius embodied the collection of Apostolius in his own.

Ἐμασχαλίσθη<sup>1</sup>. ἔθος<sup>2</sup> ἦν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις<sup>3</sup> ὁπότε<sup>4</sup> φονεύσειαν ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς τιναν, τὸ ἔργον ἀφοσιουμένοις ἀκρωτηριάξιν τὸν νεκρὸν, καὶ τῶν μορίων ὄρμαθόν ποιήσαντας, κρημνάναι<sup>5</sup> κατὰ<sup>6</sup> τοῦ τραχήλου, κατὰ τῶν μασχαλῶν διείροντας·<sup>7</sup> ἀφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ μασχαλισμάτα προσηγόρευσαν αὐτά<sup>8</sup>. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Τρωίλῳ πλήρη μασχαλισμάτων εἴρηκε τὸν μασχαλισμόν, καὶ ἐν Ἡλέκτρῳ.

On the face of it this gloss is a working over of the note of Ar. Byz. This is shown not only by the identity of language, but by the fact that the glossarist cites that passage of the *Electra* apropos of which we know that Aristophanes wrote his comment.<sup>9</sup> There is an important difference, however, in that the present gloss declares that the mutilation was for the sake of "atoning for the deed," whereas Aristophanes appears to have said it was ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν μῆριν ἐκκλίνειν, which has been shown to be quite another thing. The easiest explanation is that the author of the gloss now under consideration misunderstood the words of Ar., which are vague enough, and thought he was interpreting them by a synonymous and clearer expression, whereas in fact he was inverting the sense. His mistake was easy if he did not carefully compare the note of Ar. with the text it was intended to explain. The idea that the purpose of the μασχαλίζειν was atonement, our glossographer got no doubt from the only source of that opinion that has yet been found, Apollonius of Rhodes.

These are all the passages that support the Müller theory, and these have all been shown, with more or less probability, to have drawn their information from the words of Apollonius, who thus stands as the sole ancient authority for that theory. Opposed to him is his predecessor in the librarian's chair at Alexandria, Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose name stands higher than his

<sup>1</sup> V. has: Ἐμασχαλίσθη. ἡκρωτηριάσθη. Σοφοκλῆς· ὑφ' ἧς θανὼν ἄτιμος ὥστε δυσμενὴς Ἐμασχαλίσθη. In Ar. the lemma is: Μασχαλισθήσῃ ποτέ· which is given as a proverb or saying. Where Ar. got it is a poser.

<sup>2</sup> ἔθος γὰρ ἦν, V.

<sup>3</sup> παλαιοῖς, Ar.

<sup>4</sup> ὅτε, V.

<sup>5</sup> ποιήσαντες κρεμᾶν, V. Ar. also has ποιήσαντες.

<sup>6</sup> κατὰ τραχήλου κατὰ τῶν μασχαλῶν διείροντας, Ar. κατὰ τοῦ τ. καὶ τῶν μ., V.

<sup>7</sup> om. V.

<sup>8</sup> Ar. has . . . αὐτὰ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἡλέκτρῳ καὶ Τρωίλῳ, and there stops. V. stops with αὐτά, omitting all that follows. The text of Suid. is not at all clear. Some MSS add Ἐμασχαλίσθη after Ἡλέκτρῳ. Bernh. suggests εἴρηκε δὲ τὸν μασχαλισμόν Σ. ἐν Τρ. λέγων πλήρη μασχαλισμάτων, καὶ ἐν Ἡλ. Nauck (Ar. B. Fragg. p. 221, n. 63) says: Certe Soph. non dixit πλήρη μασχαλισμάτων. Tentabam εἴρηκε καὶ τὸ Ἐμασχαλίσθη ἐν Ἡλέκτρῳ.

<sup>9</sup> Ἀριστοφάνης [φῆσι] παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Ἡλέκτρῳ κείσθαι τὴν λέξιν ἔθος σημαίνουσαν. Photius l. c.

own on the rolls of Alexandrian scholarship, and whose notes on the tragedians were especially prized. This Aristophanes tells us that the *μασχαλίζειν* was perpetrated to avert or to shun (for *ἐκκλίνειν* will bear either sense) the dead man's wrath; and that too, not by propitiating his shade, for we have seen that the very passage on which Aristoph. is commenting shows that the mutilation made the manes furiously angry. To avert the dead man's wrath, then, must mean to avert the consequences of that wrath. This end might have been attained, perhaps, in two ways, either (1) by rendering the ghost powerless by propitiating the gods below so that they would restrain the angry shade, or (2) by rendering the ghost powerless through some direct effect which mutilation of the body would have upon the shade. The first of these suppositions can only with great difficulty be applied to the *μασχαλίζειν*. The whole tone of the Aeschylean *κομμός* is against it; for in this *κομμός* Agamemnon is represented not as restrained by the infernal divinities—nothing is said about that—but as powerless in himself. His shade is weak and miserable because he has been shamefully murdered, because his funeral has been unbecomingly conducted, and because his corpse has been insulted by mutilation. Besides, it is in contradiction to all Greek feeling to suppose that the gods below—among them the *Dii Manes*—could have been pleased with indignities offered to a corpse. But in no other way can we bring Aristoph. into line with Apollonius and accept the first of the two suppositions we have just made. We are compelled to believe that Aristoph. meant to record the old belief that the murderer shunned the wrath of his victim's ghost by making that ghost powerless in itself, and that this powerlessness came from the fact that the arm-pitting of the body had a direct and corresponding effect upon the soul, which was thus, so to speak, arm-pitted too. In support of this interpretation may be quoted the very clear statement of the Laurentian Scholiast on Soph. El. 445 (Oxf. ed., I 326):

εἰώθεσαν οἱ δρῶντες ἐμφύλιον φόνον ἀκρωτηριάζειν τοὺς ἀναιρεθέντας, ἐκ παντὸς μέρους τοῦ σώματος ἀποταμνόμενοι, [καὶ] περιίπτειν ἑαυτοῖς τὰ ἄκρα συνείραντες διὰ τούτων, ὥσπερ τὴν δύναμιν ἐκείνων ἀφαιρούμενοι, διὰ τὸ μὴ παθεῖν εἰς ὕστερον τι παρ' ἐκείνων δεινόν· ἐφόρουσι δὲ εἰς τὰς μασχάλας τὰ ἄκρα, ὃ καὶ μασχαλίσαι ἔλεγον.

These are plain words, something like what Aristophanes himself would tell us, perhaps, if we had his gloss just as he wrote it. The Schol. goes on (with an *ἄλλως*) to give another note,

which, though confused by some reminiscence of Ap. Rhod., is in general confirmatory. According to this addition, the purpose of the ceremony was, ἵνα ἀσθενὴς γένοιτο (sc. ὁ θανὼν) πρὸς τὸ ἀντιτίσασθαι τὸν φονέα.<sup>1</sup>

The upshot of our investigation so far appears to be this. Apollonius, whose words are only repeated, and therefore not confirmed, by certain glossarists and scholiasts, asserts that the *μασχαλίζειν* was a rite of purification, and he is thus the sole authority for the Müller theory. Aristophanes, as explained and perhaps confirmed by the Laurentian Scholiast, says that the result of the *μασχαλίζειν* was to weaken the shade so that it could not harm the murderer. The passages in Aesch. and Soph. fit better with the explanation of Aristophanes, to whom, other things being equal, we are bound to give as much consideration as to Apollonius. Only by inference, however, have we reached the Paley theory in its entirety, for nothing has yet shown directly that the weakness of the manes was supposed to result from a mutilation corresponding to that perpetrated on the corpse and resulting from it. To establish this proposition comparative evidence must be adduced.

It must be shown that savage tribes—whether Aryan or non-Aryan matters not, for there is no question of derivation or kinship, and the savage mind works similarly always—have or have had a custom similar to the *μασχαλίζειν* and that their belief in the matter coincides with the theory of Paley. Further, we must prove, if possible, that like beliefs and like practices, descended inferentially from primitive barbarism, have been observed among civilized peoples, who may, perhaps, have forgotten or sophisticated the original meaning of those rites. If we can do this, and if the results agree with the Paley theory, we must regard that theory as

<sup>1</sup> The confusion of the scholiast consists in saying that the mutilation was perpetrated ἐπὶ ταῖς καθάρσεσι and in then adding the clause here quoted. Ἐπὶ ταῖς καθάρσεσι τοῦ φονεθέντος τὰ ἄκρα ἔτεμνον, καὶ περὶ τὴν μασχάλην αὐτοῦ ἐκρέμαζον αὐτὰ, ἵνα, φησὶν, κτλ. The Schol. had Ap. R. in mind, for he quotes ἐξάργματα τάμνε θανόντος. Suid. s. ν. *μασχαλισθῆναι* repeats, in a different order, the glosses of the Schol. Laur. He has *φασὶν* for *φησὶν*. It is impossible not to suspect that both notes of the Schol. Laur. come ultimately from Ar. Byz. Perhaps, too, the Et. Magn. used the Scholium in making up his article, or both he and the Schol. Laur. may have had the Aristophanic gloss in a similar form. This last supposition, however, has several arguments against it. All that we can be sure of is that we have the note of Ar. Byz. in a mutilated shape that obscures its meaning at first sight, and that some of the old scholiasts must have had it in an equally misleading form.

established, even though none of our former conclusions with regard to the scholia be accepted. For the argument from comparison, though here used to supplement an argument from tradition, is really independent of that argument. If Ar. Byz. and Ap. R. and Soph. and Aesch. should all be shown to array themselves against the Paley theory, that theory, if supported by comparison, may snap its fingers at them all, as Comparative Etymology snaps its fingers at the Cratylus. On the face of it, the Greek *μασχαλίζειν* was a relic of savage times, a "survival in culture," as Dr. Tylor would call it, and in such matters traditional interpretations are notoriously untrustworthy.

The belief that the spirits of the dead may haunt the living, doing them all manner of mischief, from mere fright to bodily injury and even violent death, is so widespread and familiar that a mere mention of it is sufficient. For Greek examples may serve the angry shade of Achilles, the maiden's ghost that haunted Pausanias,<sup>1</sup> the capital goblin story in Lucian (Philops. 31), and the spectre of Gello, who, dying before her time, haunted the earth, robbing mothers of their children.<sup>2</sup> Murderers are particularly liable to be haunted by their victims.<sup>3</sup>

Side by side with this superstition is another. The soul is a thin, airy, not quite immaterial, image of the body;<sup>4</sup> hence, naturally, a mutilated body will have a mutilated ghost. The ghost of a one-legged man will of course have but one leg. Go a step farther and you have the Paley theory of the *μασχαλίζειν*. A mutilated man cannot harm us; neither, therefore, can a mutilated shade. Let us guard against attacks from the ghosts of our enemies by cutting off members of their dead bodies.

Two examples will show that the reasoning of the last paragraph has been carried out by savages. Less than a century ago an English planter in Jamaica treated his slaves with such cruelty

<sup>1</sup> Plut. Cimon 6 (cf. Mor. 555 B).

<sup>2</sup> Hesych. *Γελλῶς*, I 421 Schmidt. Suid. *Γελλοῦς παιδοφίλωτέρα*, I, i, 1079 Bernh. Zenob. Prov. iii 3, p. 58 Schneidew. (Paroemiogr., I). Nicephorus Callistus, Eccl. Hist. xviii 9 (III, p. 347 A, Migne). Euagr. Hist. Eccl. v 21. Bernh. Schmidt, Volksleben der Neugr., 1ter Th., pp. 139, 140.

<sup>3</sup> Clytemnestra, finding that the arm-pitting has not been effectual and that Agamemnon can still torment her with frightful dreams, sends libations to his tomb. Nero was pursued by the shade of his mother; Otho was tumbled out of bed by the ghost of Galba. Suet. Nero 34, Otho 7.

<sup>4</sup> See especially Horst, Zauberbibliothek, II 251 ff., 279.

that the poor wretches took to killing themselves to escape his barbarity. The planter was equal to the occasion. He ordered the corpses of the suicides to be decapitated. The negroes, since they believe that one whose body is thus mutilated will have to pass the future life forever headless, preferred to live and suffer rather than incur the wrath of a master who could punish both body and soul.<sup>1</sup> The native Australian tribes in recent times used, after a battle, to cut off the right thumbs of their slain foes, with the avowed purpose of escaping the vengeance of the ghosts; for, they said, these ghosts will become malignant demons, but if we cut off the right thumb of each corpse, each ghost will lack the right thumb and will not be able to throw at us his shadowy spear.<sup>2</sup>

Here we have almost an exact parallel to the treatment of Agamemnon's corpse. It is impossible not to suppose that the prehistoric Greek Clytemnestra reasoned in this matter like the modern Australian. If my husband's feet are cut off, his spirit cannot walk; if his hands are cut off, his spirit can wield neither sword nor spear. He may squeak and gibber forever, but from his attacks I am safe.

This superstition is not the isolated belief of a few wretched aborigines and degraded black slaves. It may be traced more or less distinctly surviving among nations of all degrees of civilization. Chinese criminals prefer crucifixion to decapitation, that their shades may have heads on their shoulders.<sup>3</sup> Hector appears to Aeneas wearing those wounds which he had received about Troy. Deiphobus in Hades bears marks of the wrath of Menelaus.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tylor, *Prim. Cult.* II 451-2, cf. 76. Other instances are not wanting. A Bushman magician having killed a woman, dashed her head to pieces with large stones, and, after burying her, built a fire on her grave, lest she should rise again and "trouble him." A California Indian "did not dispute the immortality of the whites, who buried their dead, but could not believe the same of his own people because they were in the habit of burning them." Lubbock, *Mental and Social Condition of Savages*, p. 140 (Am. Ed.). The same idea lies at the bottom of a story told by Henry More, *Antidotus c. Atheismum*, iii 8, § 6; a Breslau maid in the 16th century haunted her fellow servants as a Poltergeist, but all such manifestations ceased as soon as her body was burned. This is no bad instance of a "survival in culture." Compare the phantoms that haunted the place of Caligula's burial till his body was burned. Suet. *Calig.* 59.

<sup>2</sup> Tylor, *Prim. Cult.* II 451-2, cf. 76.

<sup>3</sup> Tylor, *Prim. Cult.* II 452.

<sup>4</sup> *Aen.* ii 274, vi 495.

Eurydice's shade walks "passu de vulnere tardo."<sup>1</sup> The ghost of Banquo rises with twenty mortal murders on its crown. Josephus gives as an article of the orthodox Jewish creed in his day the belief that the wicked shall rise for judgment with all their wounds and diseases on them and (apparently) shall so continue forever.<sup>2</sup> "When the Earl of Cornwall saw the fetch of his friend William Rufus carried black and naked on a black goat across the Bodmin moors, he saw that it was wounded through the midst of the breast; and afterwards he heard that at that very hour the king had been slain in the New Forest by the arrow of Walter Tirell."<sup>3</sup>

Among civilized nations, however, the opinion that a spirit may be rendered powerless by mutilation of the body<sup>4</sup> appears most commonly in connection with that wildest and ghastliest of super-

<sup>1</sup> Ov. Met. x 49. Cf. Od. λ 38-43 and Autenrieth in Nägelsbach's Hom. Theol., 2d ed., p. 405.

<sup>2</sup> Οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὐκ ἀλλοιωθέντα τὰ σώματα, οὐδὲ πάθους ἢ νόσου μεταστάντα, οὐδὲ ἐνδοξασθέντα ἀπολήφονται· ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς νοσήμασιν ἐτελεύτων, καὶ ὅποιοι ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ γεγέννηται, τοιοῦτοι πιστῶς κριθήσονται. The fragment from which this is an extract is not usually included in Greek texts of Joseph., but may be found at p. 146 of the appendix to Vol. II of Havercamp's ed. (1726), with the title ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς Ἑλλήνας λόγου τοῦ ἐπὶ γεγραμμένου κατὰ Πλάτωνα περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας. It is best known by Whiston's title, the "Discourse Concerning Hades." The discourse is, from internal evidence, certainly not above suspicion, though both Zonaras and Joh. Damascenus refer it to Josephus. (See Hudson's Jos., Oxf., 1720, Vol. I, Testimonia, No. xcix.) The passage here quoted, though it has to do simply with the resurrection of the body, is curious as indicating a popular belief that may have lent additional force to the words of our Lord: "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell," etc. Mark ix 43-47. Prof. Gildersleeve kindly refers me to Plato, Gorgias 524 C, and Lucian, Tyrannus I 646 R., passages containing the spiritual doctrine of which Josephus gives a material version. Cf. also Delitzsch, Biblical Psychol., Eng. tr., p. 503, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Tylor, Prim. Cult. II 452.

<sup>4</sup> The converse of this belief occurs in a very striking way. If you wound the spectre of a living witch who, though absent, is tormenting a victim, the body of the witch gets the wound. A typical example is that of Jane Brooks, condemned and executed for witchcraft at the "Charde Assizes," 1658. A boy whom she had "bewitched" cried out in a fit that he saw Jane Brooks on the wall. Immediately one Gibson struck at the place with a knife, upon which the boy cried out, "O, father, coz Gibson hath cut Jane Brooks's hand, and 'tis bloody." Jane was immediately visited at her house, and her hand was found to be "bloody according to what the boy had said." Glanvil, Sadducismus Triumphatus, 4th ed., 1726, pp. 286-7.



stitutions—the belief in vampires. Vampirism is a long and interesting subject, and has been much misapprehended,<sup>1</sup> even by Dr. Tylor. But only a small part of the whole subject concerns us—so much only as shall serve to link the cutting off of Agamemnon's fingers and toes with the stake driven through the corpse of a suicide in modern times. In its common form<sup>2</sup> the vampire is a human corpse which, re-animated by its own soul or by a demon, rises nightly from the grave to suck the blood of surviving kinsmen and friends. If the body be dug up, it will be found fresh and ruddy, its lips sometimes besmeared with blood. The remedy against the attacks of the vampire is to exhume him and in some way disable his body. Sometimes a stake through the heart suffices to keep him quiet. Sometimes it is required that the stake be of ash or of aspen.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes the corpse must be burned to ashes.<sup>4</sup> In Normandy it was thought necessary for the corpse to be dug up by the priest and the sexton. Then the head was to be stricken off with a grave-digger's shovel and thrown into the nearest stream, when, so heavy was it, it would sink not only to the bottom, but down through the earth straight to the centre, to hell.<sup>5</sup> In one case, near Danzig, the head was cut off and laid under the arm.<sup>6</sup> In Wallachia a long nail is sometimes driven through the skull.<sup>7</sup> In Servia, after a great panic, a graveyard was dug over and eleven corpses of supposed vampires were found. Every possible means of defence was resorted to in this case. The hearts of the corpses were pierced, their heads cut off, and all eleven bodies burned. The ashes were then thrown into a river.<sup>8</sup>

Evidently if the superstition were consistent, all this would have nothing to do with our subject; for the vampire is a body, and we are concerned with ghosts. But the superstition is not consistent.

<sup>1</sup> What Cox says about vampires and werewolves in his *Mythology* is very wide of the mark.

<sup>2</sup> We have here nothing to do with various Indian and Persian demons who have been sometimes identified with the vampire.

<sup>3</sup> Ralston, *Russ. Folk-Tales*, p. 322.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 316.

<sup>5</sup> Hertz, *Der Werwolf*, p. 110. Cf. Temme, *Volkssagen von Pommern u. Rügen*, pp. 307-8.

<sup>6</sup> Mannhardt, *Ztschr. f. deutsche Myth.* IV 262. Sometimes the head and feet are cut off, the feet placed where the head should be and the head where the feet belong. Veckenstedt, *Mythen der Zamaiten*, I 260.

<sup>7</sup> A. and A. Schott, *Walachische Märchen*, p. 298.

<sup>8</sup> Calmet, *Traité sur les Apparitions*, 1751, II 45; Horst, *Zauberbibliothek*, I 257 ff.

There are instances in which the vampire is not corporeal, but spiritual, and in these instances the means which in the case of bodily vampires are used to keep down the corpse are used to lay the ghost. This gives us distinct evidence of the "survival in culture" we are trying to make out. Such seem to be the cases in which the vampire is degraded to an ordinary Poltergeist. Duke Abel of Schleswig had procured the murder of his brother. Soon after he himself died and was buried in a cathedral. From that time the ecclesiastics were disturbed during service by a frightful din and horrible apparitions till the corpse of Abel was dug up, and, after being pierced with a stake, was sunk in a swamp in the Pölerwald.<sup>1</sup> The modern Greeks, devout believers in the vampire, often confound him with the ordinary spectre that enters houses and tosses about the furniture.<sup>2</sup> The aborigines of Lower California told the Jesuit Baegert in the last century that "they had formerly broken the spine of the deceased before burying them, and had thrown them into the ditch rolled up like a ball, believing that they would rise again if not treated in this manner."<sup>3</sup> An officer who served in Hungary in 17— says that two cavalymen of his company died of a wasting disease commonly thought in that country to result from the attacks of a vampire. "Of those assailed by this malady," he writes, "the majority think they see a white spectre following them always, as the shadow follows the body." The grave of the vampire was found, his head was chopped off, and the company rested in peace.<sup>4</sup> In most of these cases the vampire is evidently not a body, but a phantom. Lenormant (*La Magie chez les Chaldéens*, p. 188) gives what seems an excellent example of the practice of coercing the shade by disabling the body. "Selon les Tchérémisses, les âmes des morts viennent inquiéter les vivants, et, pour les en empêcher, ils percent la plante des pieds et le cœur des morts, convaincus que, cloués ainsi dans leur tombe, ils n'en pourront sortir."<sup>5</sup> In the present

<sup>1</sup> Mannhardt, p. 276. Another shadowy vampire appears in Müller's *Siebenbürgische Sagen*, p. 37, but there is no mention of staking his body.

<sup>2</sup> B. Schmidt, pp. 165-6. Cf. Tylor, II 193-4. The modern Greeks seem to have got their vampire from the Slavonians, though Schmidt (168 ff.) tries hard to show that at least the essential elements of the superstition existed among the ancients.

<sup>3</sup> Rep. of the Regents of the Smithson. Inst. for 1864, p. 387.

<sup>4</sup> Calmet, II 69-70.

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, however, the words of the Baron von Haxthausen, Lenormant's authority, are not quite clear, and may be interpreted as showing that

century a ghost is said to have been laid in Iceland by driving two steel nails into the grave.<sup>1</sup>

The most satisfactory proof of the use of staking as a means of laying a ghost is perhaps the English mode of burying suicides. Several hundred years ago the real corporeal vampire was not unknown in Britain,<sup>2</sup> and it was no doubt while belief in him was prevalent that the custom of burying suicides<sup>3</sup> with a stake through the body arose. Later the vampire superstition quite died out, and to-day most Englishmen do not know what the word means. But the custom of impaling suicides did not die out. The suicide was thought likely to rise as an ordinary ghost, not as a vampire, but the stake was as efficacious in keeping down the spirit as it had been in keeping down the body. In New England, where nobody ever believed in vampires, the stake has been used once at least in the case of a witch who died a natural death.<sup>4</sup> Here again the purpose was evidently to prevent the ghost from walking.

the spectres feared by the Turco-Tatar Cheremiss tribe and by their neighbors, the Finnish Chouwassi, are either the souls of the dead, as Lenormant takes it, or their re-animated bodies. Haxthausen, *Études sur la situation intérieure de la Russie*, 1847, I 418-19, 430.

<sup>1</sup>Árnason, *Íslenzkar Þjóðsögur*, I 263.

<sup>2</sup>Calmet, II 85, cites Guil. Malsb. ii 4: nequam hominis cadaver post mortem Daemone agente discurrere. This reference I have failed to find. Calmet also quotes William of Newburgh without reference. The place is Guil. Neubrig. *Hist. Rer. Anglic.* v 22-24, II 567 ff., ed. Hearne, Oxf. 1719. William gives a good deal of information about Buckinghamshire vampires in his day (12th century). A case of vampirism in Wales in the same century is described by Walter Mapes, *de Nugis Curial.*, ii 27, p. 103 Wright. I owe the reference to Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 34. These British vampires do not seem to have been bloodsuckers.

<sup>3</sup>For suicides are especially likely to become vampires. See a good instance in Henry More, *Antidotus contra Atheismum*, iii 8. The mutilation in this case (which happened at Breslau in the 16th century) is noteworthy in connection with the *μασχαλίζειν*. The arms, legs and head were cut off.

<sup>4</sup>This was Goody Cole, of Hampton, N. H. Her death and burial, which took place not far from 1656, are described in S. G. Drake's *Annals of Witchcraft in N. E.*, p. 102. In 1660 the General Court of Mass. enacted that every "self-murderer shall be denied the privilege of being buried in the common burying place of Christians, but shall be buried in some common highway . . . and a cartload of stones laid upon his grave, as a brand of infamy, and a warning to others to beware of like damnable practices." By 4 Geor. IV, c. 52, a person *felo de se* is to be buried "without any stake being driven through the body of such person, in the churchyard or other burial ground of the parish," etc. For these references I am indebted to the Hon. Chas. H. Bell

Let us sum up the results of our comparative investigation. We have shown that by more than one people the mutilation of the body has been held to work a corresponding mutilation on the shade or ghost; that among savages this belief has led to the custom of mutilating the corpse of an enemy in order that his shade may be unable to harm the slayer. We have also shown that this belief, though rarely to be found in its entirety among civilized men, appears once to have had wide acceptance, and to have left its imprint on enlightened nations in certain features of the vampire superstition and certain customs of impalement before burial. In the light of these facts we can hardly deny that Clytemnestra arm-pitted the murdered Agamemnon, not to cleanse herself from the guilt of his death, but to mangle and weaken the shade of the dead hero. As she struck the living man to be rid of her husband, she struck the dead man to be rid of her husband's ghost.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

and to Mr. C. A. Snow. The last suicide buried at cross-roads in England was Griffiths in 1823. No stake was driven through his body, nor was any lime thrown over it. N. and Q., 1st ser., VII 617. For the cairn, cf. Gregor, Folk-Lore of the North of Scot., p. 214, and in particular Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, pp. 274, 275. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, 1828, p. 727, cites a law by which a man who had drowned himself in a well was to be buried with a stone on his head, another on his body, a third on his feet. Michelet, *Origines du Droit français*, 1837, p. 371, quotes Grimm, adding, very pertinently: "On craignait évidemment que le mort ne *revînt* et n'errât." Cf. Liebrecht *l. c.*